

I have already indicated that it is my intent for the Senate to begin debate on the Clean Water Act on tomorrow. Much has been made of this legislation as a test case of partisanship between the Congress and the President. But if one looks at the record, and it is a very clear record at that, it is clear that this legislation has strong, deep, and broad-based support that transcends party lines.

The bill to clean up the Nation's waters is legislation that is supported in both Houses unanimously. It transcends partisanship. The Senate will vote on that legislation in that spirit. And, I have every hope that the President will receive it in that spirit.

Creating an omnibus trade bill is high on the Senate's agenda. Each of the respective committees has begun its work to fashion this important piece of legislation. It will not be "protectionist" legislation so narrowly defined that it has all the attributes of a baseball bat. Such legislation would be counterproductive to world trade. It is my hope that this comprehensive legislation will be designed to treat the causes, not just the symptoms, of our disastrous trade deficit. This omnibus package should be assembled by May 1.

It is my expectation to bring up for a vote, as soon as the Foreign Relations Committee completes its work, two long-standing test ban treaties that have yet to be ratified: The 1974 Threshold Test Ban Treaty and the 1976 Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty. We must keep the arms control process moving forward. The Senate should be voting on these treaties in the last week of January or the first week of February with the cooperation of the administration.

I have every hope that in the first 60 to 90 days of this session, legislation on the very important topic of campaign finance reform will move forward.

The Senate Armed Services Committee, under the distinguished leadership of Senator NUNN, is holding important hearings on military strategy this week. And Senator PELL, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, is likewise beginning hearings this week on foreign policy.

I would urge my colleagues to be attentive to these important hearings. We cannot just build costly weapons systems that are not linked to a sound strategic purpose.

Mr. President, as we all are aware, much of the Nation would like to know the "how's," the "why's," and the "who" did it concerning the Iran-Contra misadventure. The issue continues to be very much in the press and each revelation seems to make it all the more complicated to understand.

It is important to know and to remember that this work must be done well if we are to rebuild the public trust. Let us have patience that this process will work as it is intended.

The Senate Select Committee on Military Assistance to Iran, and the Nicaraguan Resistance is in the process of organization and will soon be ready to begin its work.

Mr. President, have my 10 minutes expired?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 2 minutes 50 seconds remaining.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska [Mr. STEVENS], the acting minority leader, is recognized.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, both the Republican leader and our assistant leader are not in Washington yet today. I am pleased to have the chance to stand in for our leader. As Senator BYRD has mentioned, he is attending to business in his State and we expect him to be here tomorrow.

I have but one comment to make, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that the Republican leader's time that I do not use be yielded to the Senator from Maine when he appears on the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the President pro tempore.

#### SENATE ARMS CONTROL OBSERVER GROUP

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, in the last Congress, those of us who were involved in the arms control observer group for the Senate spent a great deal of time in Geneva. I think I was there at least eight times.

I want to report to the Senate that on every occasion the group traveled to Geneva, the ranking Soviet negotiator, Ambassador Viktor Karpov, was most gracious to all of us, and particularly to me. We spent a great deal of time with Ambassador Karpov trying to make sure that the Soviet negotiators understood the role of the Senate in the treaty-making power under our U.S. Constitution.

We were not negotiators, as the Senate realizes. In fact, since 1951, Senators have not been negotiators with foreign powers in the treaty-making process. As representatives of the Senate, however, we have spent a great deal of time with Ambassador Karpov. We noted last year that the Soviet Government had created a new department related to arms control and placed Ambassador Karpov in charge of it. That was the signal to us that in all probability there would be a change in the negotiators.

As has been announced, the First Deputy Foreign Minister, Yuli Vorontsov, has been named to replace Ambassador Karpov as the chief Russian ne-

gotiator in Geneva. That has been welcomed by all of us who have participated in observing this process.

It means that the negotiator for the Soviets will come from a different portion of the Soviet Government and will have, we hope, greater access to General Secretary Gorbachev.

As the change is made in Geneva, I would like to express my gratitude to Ambassador Karpov for the courtesy and generous allocation of time he extended in Geneva to representatives of the U.S. Senate. While we welcome the opportunity to become acquainted with Mr. Vorontsov, we will miss Ambassador Karpov. Mr. Karpov has spent time, as I have stated, with us at dinners and at receptions and has been willing to enter into a toe-to-toe dialog with Members of the Senate that we found very informative and helpful. We will miss him.

We hope that we will have a chance to have a similar relationship with his successor.

As I have indicated, I would like to yield the remainder of our leader's time to my good friend, Senator COHEN.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine.

#### PROPOSED STAFF REPORT OF SENATE INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEE

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, last week, a vote concerning the proposed staff report from the Senate Intelligence Committee on the Iran affair sparked a partisan debate in this Chamber. In my judgment, that debate was unnecessary. I think it was avoidable and it was unbecoming to the Senate.

I did not object to the releasing of a staff report because I am part of any clique out to undo the President. I do not want to see the President politically paralyzed during his final 2 years of office because, if he is paralyzed, the country is similarly afflicted.

I think there is time enough for those who aspire to that high office to place themselves before the not so tender mercies of the American people and offer their own visions for the future.

The public will not tolerate a crass exploitation of the President's present difficulties for partisan political advantage.

I might add there has been no evidence of any partisan attempt to manipulate the Senate hearings in the Intelligence Committee. Frankly, based upon my experience and respect for Senator INOUYE, there will be none in the future. So I think we have little to fear in that regard.

Last week, a copy of one of the drafts prepared by the staff was leaked either by a Senator or a member of his staff to a certain television network. I would only say that a great disservice has been done to this



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 100<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 133

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 1987

No. 4

## House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 20, 1987, at 12 noon.

## Senate

MONDAY, JANUARY 12, 1987

The Senate met at 12 noon, and was called to order by the Honorable WENDELL H. FORD, a Senator from the State of Kentucky.

Mr. FORD. The Chaplain will offer the prayer.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of the nations, Lord of history, this is not just another Congress—this is the 100th Congress, a critical benchmark in the life of our Nation.

Grant, Gracious Father, that these next 2 years will be 2 of the most significant, productive years in our Nation's history. May the full potential for great statesmanship and wise national leadership be realized. May truth and justice be the hallmark of debate and decision. Grant to our leaders a special dispensation of wisdom, strength and courage and to all the Members the resolve and ability to fulfill their finest aspirations for themselves, the peoples' trust, the welfare of the Nation and the world. We pray this in the name of Him who is love, truth, justice, and righteousness incarnate. Amen.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. STENNIS). The Chair recognizes the Senator from West Virginia.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal be considered approved to date.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### SCHEDULE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it had been my hope that the Senate could proceed today to the consideration of the bill to clean up the Nation's waters, which by general agreement has been placed on the Calendar of General Orders, and is shown on the calendar as S. 1.

Mr. DOLE, by request, has also put on the calendar S. 76, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, to provide for the renewal of the quality of the Nation's waters, which he will, I presume, offer or want to offer as an amendment to the bill, S. 1, which I hope to have before the Senate on tomorrow.

I had intended to try to get to the Senate bill today but because the Governor of Mr. DOLE's State of Kansas is being inaugurated today—Mr. DOLE felt that he should be there, and I agree that he should—I will not make any effort to proceed to take up that bill this morning.

Mr. DOLE last week indicated to me that he would be back today by 5 p.m., and I will renew that discussion with him at that time. So it will not be my intention to make any motion during the time between now and 5 o'clock today in connection with the clean water bill.

Meanwhile, this morning I have been indirectly informed that Senator

DOLE may not be coming back today at 5 p.m., but I have not heard from him directly on that. I hope that I will hear from the distinguished minority leader on that matter because it is my intent, as of now, to proceed to take up that bill on tomorrow. Rollcall votes may very well occur on tomorrow. There will not be rollcall votes today in view of the facts I have just outlined concerning the program.

Committees are meeting today. That is necessary if we are to progress with the work of the Senate, and get an early start on that work. The Foreign Relations Committee is meeting. The Armed Services Committee is meeting today. Other committees are meeting, and in order to carry out their oversight functions under the Constitution, committees need to meet.

Also in order to advance legislation to the calendar, committees need to meet early, conduct their hearings, and mark up early. So they are proceeding in that fashion. I want to accommodate committees as much as I can in the scheduling of the floor work, early on in the session, especially. So today there will not be any rollcall votes, and committees may meet without interruption.

Under the order, the Senate will go out no later than 2 o'clock today to reconvene at 5 p.m. this day.

### AGENDA

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate of the United States has a very full agenda in the next 60 to 90 days. I want to take this opportunity to review what that agenda will be about.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

January 12, 1987

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 597

institution by that act. Members of the press are now under tremendous pressure to acquire copies of the document as well.

Senator BOREN and I have been asked to release that report now that one network has a copy. We believe it would be a serious mistake to compound an error by repeating it in the name of journalistic equity. We would be setting a precedent that would place an even greater premium than currently exists for enterprising journalists to obtain copies of sensitive or classified documents. One leak and the walls protecting important information would have to come tumbling down.

Senator BOREN and I feel we simply cannot permit the Intelligence Committee to be placed in that position.

I favor releasing a report, one that is concise, one that is accurate, and one that fully and fairly reflects the evidence we have obtained in that committee. I would like to take just a few moments this afternoon to explain why I believe the release of that draft report was inappropriate and unwise.

First, I would point out that this entire matter seems worthy of a chapter by Lewis Carroll because I have the sensation that we have slipped through a rabbit hole into something of a fantasy land. Things are curiously and curiously. The President is demanding the Congress, the very institution that he avoided notifying and consulting with, must furnish him with a report describing in detail a plan that was formulated and perhaps executed either in or within a few feet of the Oval Office. This is a most curious state of affairs, in view of the fact that most of the information accumulated by the committee is readily available to the President through his Cabinet and members of his staff. Almost all of our witnesses have been from the White House or the Central Intelligence Agency.

It occurs to me that the White House has two objectives in mind. One is to shift the responsibility to Congress for disclosing the details of a major covert operation that either originated with the administration and its ally, Israel, or was initiated by Israel and subsequently approved by the President. The second objective is to insist that Congress validate the President's claim that he had no knowledge of the diversion of funds to the Contras.

I believe the Intelligence Committee can and should meet the objectives of the administration while not sacrificing its integrity or independence in the search for the truth on this entire matter.

While there are many intriguing characters who played a role in this operation, there are essentially two major issues involved:

First, Did President Reagan authorize the sale of weapons to certain groups in Iran in order to start a so-called strategic dialog and to obtain

the release of our hostages being held in Lebanon?

Second, Did he know about the alleged diversion of funds to the Contras?

I should say, by way of preliminary comment, a few words about the motivation of the President and his men. There was absolutely no evidence of malice or malevolence on the part of any the individuals involved in the matter under investigation. There were dedicated public servants who sought no gain other than the welfare of our country and its citizens. I do not believe that anyone can fairly criticize President Reagan or any of the members of his administration for seeking to open a dialog with whatever factions may exist in Iran.

I have serious doubts that so-called moderates exist, but I point out that if the Ayatollah Khomeini were to depart this life today or tomorrow and a power struggle were then to begin and chaos perhaps prevail, the President and his administration would be under very severe criticism not only from the Congress but the country and the press for not having undertaken some effort to determine whether we could modify or alter our relationship with the successors to the Khomeini regime. So the President deserves to be commended for at least seeking out whatever options might be available to us in the future.

Second, no one can criticize the President for seeking the return of hostages. That is a matter that was foremost on his mind and foremost on the minds not only of the families of the hostages but members of the public and the Congress.

Everyone wanted the hostages to be returned home. So he was highly motivated in seeking the return of the hostages.

The mistake that was made is that what started out as a conceptual need to open lines of communication with so-called Iranian moderates evolved rather quickly into a predominant concern of securing the release of hostages at least at the operational level.

Again, while I would not question the President's motivation, he nevertheless undertook to privatize a foreign and covert policy: He in essence took foreign policy underground by cutting out the State Department, for all practical purposes the Defense Department, and the CIA and most specifically, Congress, and he placed the responsibility for this covert policy and its execution in the hands of a few individuals in a small office located in the White House or across the street in the Old Executive Office Building.

Unfortunately, heroes on the battlefield can become hand grenades in the field of foreign policy and international diplomacy. The President turned to amateurs instead of listening to professionals and, in my judgment, he must accept the consequences for the actions of those selected to carry out the twin goals of the administration of

first sending arms to Iran and second, raising private or third party funds for the Contras in Nicaragua.

A dispute exists whether the President ever authorized the Israelis to transfer TOW missiles to Iran with the understanding that the Israelis could replace them with future purchases from the United States. There is conflicting evidence on this point, but it is my personal judgment that authority was given, since Israel would not want to incur the ill will of the United States nor risk drawing down its own weapons stocks. The issue is not a small one but it is also not a dispositive one, either, because, whether the authority was granted in advance or approved retroactively, the fact remains that the President did approve of the transfer and sale of arms to the Iranians certainly no later than by January of 1986.

I am also prepared to say without hesitation that the committee received no evidence that the President had any knowledge that the funds were diverted to the Contras. Our evidence, however, is incomplete because several key witnesses have pleaded the fifth amendment against self incrimination.

Again, in my judgment, this is an important point but not in itself a vindicating one. Because even if the President did not know, I believe he should have known. He was responsible for circumventing the institution mechanisms for the development and execution of foreign policy.

The White House is not the political equivalent of the First National Bank of Boston, and the National Security Council employees are not bank tellers. They are trustees.

The President cannot be held accountable for those acts of agents and employees who act well beyond the scope of their authority. But he surely is responsible when he sets up a mechanism that is specifically designed to eliminate the institutional checks and balances against rash or impetuous conduct in the affairs of the executive branch of Government.

Consider for a moment Lt. Col. Oliver North. Colonel North was given two essential tasks: First, to help transfer arms to Iran; and second, to raise funds for the Contras. He carried out the express wishes of the President in executing his first task. He was also responsible for raising private and third-party funds, perhaps even third-country funds, for the Contras. At some point, the twin tracks merged. Whether the idea was suggested by the Israelis or Mr. Ghorbanifar or Mr. Khashoggi or whether it originated with Colonel North, it nonetheless was foreseeable that North might seize upon the opportunity to carry out his assignments by wearing one white hat instead of two.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. According to the agreement, the Senator's time has expired.

S 598

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

January 12, 1987

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I thank the Chair. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COHEN. It is my opinion that the President must assume responsibility for those actions or excesses even though he was unaware of them.

For example, there are press reports that administration officials were asked to solicit contributions from third countries and private individuals. If so, it may be asked, how far from the scope of his assumed authority did Colonel North stray in arranging for a portion of the windfall profits from the sale of arms to the Iranians to go to the Contras?

It is possible to argue, depending upon the evidence as to who controlled the Swiss accounts, that the profits may be construed as an Israeli contribution or a Saudi contribution or an Iranian contribution or even a second contribution to the Contras. And if so, again, I suggest, the President would be hard-pressed to say that he bears no responsibility for the diversion of funds if in fact funds or military equipment arrived in the hands of the Contras.

My objection to making a formal and public filing of the staff report was not that the report is in some respects inaccurate or incomplete, although it is clear to me that it is. Not one member of the committee has had an opportunity to even read it. Transcripts were not even available for 12 of the 37 witnesses. There was no index of extensive documents received by the committee.

I might point out that since the report was debated and a copy of it leaked to the press, we have discovered at least one document that evidently was not considered in the draft report.

Aside from those objections, which in my judgment are very important, my objection is that the publication of the documents contained in that report would be a fire-sale invitation for those witnesses who have yet to testify to tailor their testimony either to conform to or to contradict the preliminary evidence as it serves their interest to do so.

The care that the Intelligence Committee took to sequester witnesses, to limit their ability to discuss their testimony with others, or to review the transcripts of their testimony would be completely negated by releasing in detail what the committee was able to obtain.

It would also, in my opinion, serve as a tacit revocation of the mission of the new investigating committees in Congress to complete the search for the facts and for the truth.

That may serve the interests of the President and the Presidency. But it would not serve the interests of this institution or this country.

There is a responsible middle course to pursue—one that will advise the

President and the public of an agreed-upon set of facts and some tentative conclusions.

It is my hope, and I know that Senator BOREN shares this hope, that we can publish a report within the next 2 weeks that will contain the essence of our very brief and incomplete inquiry.

One more word: There was a report today in the Washington Post that suggested that, somehow, Senator DURENBERGER was responsible for deleting certain portions from the report. That clearly was not the case. Senator DURENBERGER was only responding to objections of committee members, including myself, against releasing specific conclusions upon which there was not agreement.

For all of these reasons, I opposed a premature disclosure of a report that was unneeded and unauthorized by committee members.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Oklahoma wishes to speak on the same subject the Senator from Maine did and I shall be happy to yield to him.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have 2 minutes remaining, do I not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield that 2 minutes to Mr. BOREN to conform to the suggestion by Mr. PROXMIRE.

Would Mr. BOREN yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BOREN. I am happy to yield.

## MEASURE PLACED ON CALENDAR

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the House message on cleaning up the Nation's waters be placed on the calendar. That measure is the same language as S. 1, which is already on the calendar.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this matter has been cleared.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this matter has been cleared with the ranking member on the appropriate committee. There is no objection to placing the House bill—it is my understanding that is what it is—on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished acting leader. I ask unanimous consent that this time not be taken out of the 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## PROPOSED STAFF REPORT OF SENATE INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEE

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for yielding to me, and I thank the Senator from Wisconsin and others for indulging to me the opportunity to follow on the remarks just made by the distinguished vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee, the Senator from Maine.

First of all, Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have just been made. I think they are an indication of the determination of both the vice chairman and myself that Senate Intelligence Committee conducts itself in a completely bipartisan fashion, in a responsible fashion, to assure that the report which we make to the new special investigating committee will be as thorough, as fair, and as accurate as possible and will be one that will reflect the testimony given to our committee thus far and will be one that will be able to obtain a broad consensus from the entire membership of the Intelligence Committee as we present a report from our committee to the successor special investigating committee.

I wish to associate myself with his remarks about reports in the media today indicating that responsibility for the deleting of some information from earlier drafts of the report rest with the earlier chairman of the committee, Senator DURENBERGER from Minnesota. I also believe that those reports are not fair to the Senator from Minnesota. I do not believe that he bears individual responsibility for those deletions. I think, again, it is an example of the way in which things occur when there is an opportunity to rush through a report before it is time to finally present it and to consider all the evidence in presenting it. I think there was simply a desire to be cautious, as those from the executive branch were suggesting deletions of certain materials, that they not be included in a report that might be released to the public. I do not think it represents an attempt on the part of the Senator from Minnesota to try to keep any information from coming to the attention of those who will have responsibility for continuing the investigation.

Let me say again, Mr. President—this has been said by the vice chairman of the committee—those reports, which are draft reports which have been inappropriately apparently leaked to certain people in the media, do not represent any official report of the Senate Intelligence Committee. It appears that an earlier draft, perhaps a second draft, has been leaked to members of the press. It is very dangerous to draw any conclusions from the draft report which is apparently now under consideration in certain parts of the media. It is not complete. It is not fully accurate as to fact. It was not even the final staff draft pre-

January 12, 1987

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 599

sented to the committee last Monday, and I point out that that final staff draft was not adopted by the committee. The committee did not vote to adopt it. In fact, at the time of the meeting it had been prepared only so recently that not a single member of the committee had even had a chance to read it.

I can cite many examples as to why it is dangerous to try to draw conclusions from the fragments, bits and pieces of information which apparently are now out in the media.

One example of an error in fact is that the draft document which is apparently out in the media has July 7, 1986, as the date of a briefing of the Vice President on the Iran program by an Israeli official in Jerusalem. In fact, the correct date of that briefing was July 29, 1986. The briefing occurred 3 days after the release of the American hostage, Father Lawrence Jenco, and the position of the two events in relation to each other had an effect upon the contents of the briefing given by that official to the Vice President.

Now, I just cite that as one example. I am not going to get into the practice of coming to this floor and correcting everything that appears in the media. I cite it as an example merely to point out again there has been no official report of the Intelligence Committee. As the vice chairman has just said, at the time of the preparation of early staff recommendations there had not been a full and complete index of all of the documents in the custody of the committee. That index is now being prepared so we can assure that all documents have been read and considered before a staff report is finally prepared.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. I am sorry, the Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BOREN. I ask if I might be allowed 2 additional minutes to complete my remarks on this subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. It is so ordered.

Mr. BOREN. Second, as has been pointed out by my colleague from Maine, the testimony of at least a dozen witnesses had not even been transcribed by the staff reporter at the time these draft documents were prepared. And so, of course, it is dangerous to draw any conclusions. No final report can be prepared by our committee for submission to the new special committee until all of this information is drawn together. We are now attempting to do so.

In addition to the example of a factual error which I just cited, there are other examples that could be cited. In many cases we had testimony of only one witness as to a certain course of events, and draft staff reports stated the testimony of one witness in many cases as if that was a fact, where in fact there was no corroborating evidence, no corroborating testimony sought by the committee to make sure

that the testimony of an individual was fully accurate. So there are many things that we must consider before a final report is presented, and we are doing that. We are attempting to do it in an expeditious fashion. But in trying to do that we must dust off some old-fashioned terms that deserve their place, a term like "bipartisan," so that we can make sure the report is an accurate reflection of what the committee heard, a term like "statesmanship," so that we do not rush to any kind of political judgments on this matter, terms like "thorough" and "accurate."

We have a heavy responsibility, Mr. President; the reputations of individuals in this Government are at stake. The reputation of the United States and its foreign policy is at stake around the world as others are watching us. We are determined to do a thorough, professional, and fair job of summarizing the evidence that has been presented to our committee so that it can be passed on to the new special committee. We are also, Mr. President, determined that that new committee, as the Senate directed, shall then make the decision about what shall be released to the public, because premature release of information can allow witnesses, who might be called, an opportunity to change their stories, to come up with explanations or perhaps to even destroy evidence that might be valuable to the committee if they are tipped off by the premature release of too much information too soon.

Mr. President, we are determined to do the right kind of job for the American people. I thank the Chair for its indulgence.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article which I wrote on this subject which appeared in USA Today on January 12, this morning, appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The USA Today, Jan. 12, 1987]

RELEASING REPORT NOW WOULD MISLEAD PUBLIC

(By David L. Boren)

WASHINGTON.—The American people have a right to know the whole truth about the Iranian arms controversy. Congress has a duty to do its best to learn all of the facts and, once it has them, to fully and accurately share them with the public.

We must never forget that the effort to get all of the facts can be undermined by premature release of partial and fragmentary information. Such information can tip off potential witnesses about embarrassing questions that may be directed to them. It gives parties who may be involved the chance to invent explanations or to destroy potentially valuable evidence. That is why the Senate directed the new investigating committee to decide about releasing any report from the Intelligence Committee.

In addition to the threat posed to the ongoing investigation, partial and premature release of information may also mislead the public because other documents and testi-

mony not released or not yet heard may give a very different picture of events.

The Intelligence Committee has the responsibility of providing the new special investigating committee with a summary of the evidence which it has heard. The committee must do everything possible to ensure that the summary is complete, accurate, and fair. At best, the report will be a very preliminary one, because the committee was not able to obtain testimony from key witnesses like Oliver North, John Poindexter, and Richard Secord. It is impossible to answer questions about whether the law was violated, and, if so, by whom, until the new special committee obtains additional evidence.

The Intelligence Committee has not yet completed or adopted a report. Apparently, a staff draft of suggestions for a report has been inappropriately given to the news media. Drawing any conclusions from parts of the draft is dangerous.

The draft was written before the committee made a complete index of all documents in its possession and before adequate assurance could be given that material in all documents had been considered. The testimony of at least a dozen witnesses had not even been transcribed by the committee reporter when the staff report was prepared, and representatives of the White House and other agencies were given a chance to read the staff draft, possibly suggesting changes in it before the senators on the committee received it.

The Intelligence Committee can best help in the effort to get the whole truth to the public by being careful, thorough, and bipartisan in preparing the report for the new investigating committee.

#### RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

The PRESIDING pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Wisconsin is recognized now for 5 minutes.

#### CONGRESS IS PUSHING THE COUNTRY DOWN A TRAGIC ECONOMIC ROAD

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, is this country driving hellbent for a super inflation? This Senator believes that is exactly where our present policies are taking us. The inflation just over the horizon will strike precisely because the Congress, whipped on by the administration, is piling one colossal deficit on top of another. It's worse. The Federal Reserve Board is accommodating the Congress by printing the money to pay for the deficit. This is a super short-term policy. And why not? Isn't politics a super short-term business? In the short run excessive spending and the series of huge deficits expand jobs. They stretch out one of the longest uninterrupted economic recovery periods in American history. The Federal Government does all this with tax cuts. Even better it does this with no interest rate increase. In fact, interest rates fall. How come? With all that borrowing by the Federal Government, with all that explosion in the demand for credit from the American consumers whose debt in relation to income is bigger than



ever before, with all the increased borrowing by American corporations, why are interest rates so much lower than they were a few years ago? Aren't interest rates simply the price of credits? Isn't demand for credit soaring? So why aren't interest rates going through the roof? Answer. The Federal Reserve Board has flooded the country in a sea of money. Every bartender and plumber knows the Congress has gone wild with our monster-size, year-after-year deficit. But almost no one—not even leading candidates for President—understands that the Federal Reserve Board has printed all the money needed to fund that deficit and then some. I challenge any Senator to find a time in American history when the Federal Reserve Board has more sharply increased the money supply in relation to the nominal gross national product than it has in the past 2 years. The guidelines announced by the Fed for each of the measures of money M1, M2, M3 are multiples of two or three times the need for money to finance transactions in the economy. The nominal GNP provides a precise measure of that transaction need.

What does all this mean? It means that this country has gone beyond unleashing the old credit card so it can live far beyond its means year after year. Congress is not just engulfing America in debt. It is worse. It is running off all the dollars it needs to pay off the credit card like an old counterfeiter. Of course when the Federal Reserve Bank prints the money, there's nothing counterfeit about it. It's strictly legal tender. And it works like magic.

Some of our leading congressional lights ask so what? What is wrong with this? They say just look at the results: Are prices up? No, indeed. Inflation is behaving like a pussy cat. How about interest rates? Interest rates are lower than they have been for 10 years. Ninety day Treasury bills have fallen from 14 percent in 1981, and 10.7 percent in 1982 to 5.65 percent today. Is that bad? Why, no, it's economic heaven. So if we get these results, why aren't these exactly the right policies? Well, in the short run they are right. They work. They are great. The country has an explosion in Federal Government spending programs. That makes millions of the beneficiaries of these programs happy. It gets better. There is no increase in taxes to pay for these explosive spending programs. That makes 100 million plus taxpayers happy and grateful. Meanwhile, the recovery continues. Inflation falls. Interest rates stay down.

All that is the short run. How about the long run? Of course, there is always the possibility that the country is writing a new chapter in economic history. Maybe this nirvana, this heaven on Earth can go on indefinitely. Will the debt burden not haunt us? Will the interest on that debt not consume an increasing share of our na-

tional income? No. That will not happen if the Federal Reserve Board continues to crank out the money. They can just print it—millions, billions, trillions of dollars. So what is wrong? What's wrong is that the time comes when time catches up with us. The time comes when there is just too much money chasing too few goods. Countries have pursued the old print-the-money policy for centuries. They always end up with inflation, super inflation. This Congress is pursuing a shameful, selfish, strictly short-term economic policy that might help incumbents win the next election. It spells long term disaster for our country.

#### THE SUPER-POWER MARCH TO DEATH

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, what are the most likely scenarios for nuclear war? The most obvious and undisputed fear is the specter of a sudden bolt from the blue. Today, tomorrow, or 10 years from now on a beautiful, bright, clear Washington day thousands of Soviet hydrogen bombs rain down on American cities. Within minutes the United States retaliates. Within hours both countries lie desolate, dead. This beautiful planet becomes a streaming, radioactive wasteland. Is this possible? Of course. Is it likely anytime in the next few years? No. Is this a long shot, outside possibility? It is a very long shot.

It could come through accident. Consider: Scenario I: With thousands of human and fallible Russians and thousands of human and fallible Americans manning 10,000 strategic warheads on each side, somehow, somewhere, some time through a series of misjudgments by someone—the fail-safe mechanism could trigger off.

Scenario II: A Soviet dictator without the limitations imposed on an American President by an independent Congress or a rigorous American peace movement, and with total control of the Soviet economic institutions and the Soviet press, in a fit of fury decides to institute a strike. He assumes that the United States would decide not to incinerate the world and would not strike back.

There are many other possible scenarios for a nuclear bolt from the Soviet blue but the mutual assurance of sure and swift mutual destruction makes any of them a very, very long shot.

Again what is a more likely path to a full-fledged nuclear war? How about the consequences of a conventional war in Europe? Consider: The Soviets respond to an uprising in East German with tanks and planes. They pursue rebel troops into West Germany. NATO forces respond with a prompt counterattack to repel this invasion of their own territory. The Soviets step up their offensive and bring their massive advantages in tanks and planes

and personnel to bear. They sweep through Germany toward France. Now keep in mind the NATO powers have specifically refused to renounce first use of nuclear weapons. NATO has thousands of tactical nuclear weapons in place in Western Europe poised and ready to move into action. Would tactical nukes stop the Soviet offensive? Yes. Would they provoke a Soviet nuclear retaliation—low level, at first? Very possible. How would NATO respond to the Soviet nuclear counterattack? Further nuclear escalation? Just enough to stop the U.S.S.R. offensive? Very possible. The confrontation might end there. It might not. The temptation for both sides to call the other's bluff—right up to the brink—would be enormous. But over the brink? To total, full-fledged nuclear war? Maybe, maybe not.

Is the terrible momentum of conventional superpower war the likeliest path to nuclear war? No. Then what is? Answer: The development of smaller, much cheaper nuclear weapons. If the superpowers continue nuclear weapons research, if they continue the testing of new nuclear weapons that validate and assure the steady march to even more devastating and cheaper nuclear weapons, those new improved nukes will in a few years find their way into the arsenals of 10 or 15 countries that now have no nuclear arsenals. Why would the so frequently predicted and never realized proliferation of nuclear weapons suddenly come to reality? Because as the nuclear technology race moves on, the new, devastating and especially cheap nukes will be a practical, easy but for many countries that cannot now afford them. In a few more years scores of nations and even terrorist groups will secure these weapons. Why not? These weapons will offer an easy, tempting bargain—a ticket to power. For the smaller countries, the cheap, new devastating nukes will provide the equalizers. What would Qadhafi in Libya give for an antimatter bomb—that provided—pound for pound—several hundred times the destructive power of the hydrogen bomb? Think what a man like Iran's Khomeini could do with it. A few terrorists traveling in the United States could quickly and easily decapitate the U.S. Government. It could obliterate the White House, the Capitol—all of Washington and everyone in it. Terrorists could utterly destroy our major cities.

Can it happen? Mr. President, if we continue this mindless technological march into ever more destructive nuclear weapons, we will build the very force that will destroy us—all of us. This Senator is not talking about odds. I'm talking about an absolute certainty. I am saying if we don't stop, somewhere, sometime, someone will utterly destroy this proud and beautiful land of ours. And who will be responsible? We will.